

## **Cabinet**

**19th January, 2005**

Author : Dave Milton/James Iles  
Special Projects Manager/Planning Officer  
(01722) 434354  
dmilton@salisbury.gov.uk

# **REPORT**

**Cllr Noeken : Cabinet Member for Planning & Economic Development**

---

### **Revised Draft Development Brief: Land at Old Sarum, Salisbury**

#### **1. Summary of the Report**

- I.1 Policies H2D and EI of the Adopted Local Plan (June 2003) allocate a mixed-use development on land north of the Portway at Old Sarum, Salisbury. This includes residential development that forms part of the overall housing requirement for the District up until 2011. The Local Plan requires that a development brief is prepared for the allocation.
- I.2 The purpose of the brief is to provide a framework for the development of the site in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.
- I.3 It is critically important that the brief sets a meaningful and robust framework that will deliver through the planning process a very high quality "place" as well as securing the social and technical infrastructure to support the new community. We are seeking to build on and deliver a quality of development that surpasses the step-change achieved at the H9, site at Boscombe Down.
- I.4 The draft development brief was given a six-week consultation earlier this year. A schedule of responses attached with the report summarises the issues that came out of the consultation exercise. The brief has been revised accordingly, as outlined in the report, and is now presented to cabinet for adoption as supplementary planning guidance (SPG).
- I.5 A copy of the revised development brief is available on the web at [www.salisbury.gov.uk](http://www.salisbury.gov.uk) and available for reference at the Planning Offices, 61 Wyndham Road, Salisbury. Members will be supplied with a copy of the revised brief by the first week of January.

#### **2. Recommendation**

- (1) That Members note the proposed revisions to the draft development brief, and the support expressed by the City Area Committee, and approve the development brief (subject to comments from the meeting of Southern Area Committee on January 26<sup>th</sup>) as setting a robust framework for delivering a very high quality mixed-use development and associated social and technical infrastructure at Old Sarum.
- (2) That the Cabinet delegate adoption of the brief to the Head of Forward Planning & Transportation following the SAC meeting on January 26<sup>th</sup> providing that SAC does not raise any objections which, in the view of the Head of Forward Planning & Transportation, are so fundamental that they should be referred back to Cabinet.

**19 January 2005**

Author : Dave Milton/James Iles  
Special Projects Manager/Planning Officer  
(01722) 434354  
dmilton@salisbury.gov.uk

# REPORT

**Cllr Noeken : Cabinet Member for Planning & Economic Development**

---

## **Revised Draft Development Brief: Land at Old Sarum, Salisbury**

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

- I.1 Policies H2D and EI of the Adopted Local Plan (June 2003) allocate a mixed-use development on land north of the Portway at Old Sarum, Salisbury. This includes residential development that forms part of the overall housing requirement for the District up until 2011. The Local Plan indicates that in order to guide and control development of the site, a development brief will be prepared.
- I.2 A draft development brief was published for a 6-week consultation period, including two public exhibitions, earlier this year. As part of this exercise, the draft brief was presented to both Southern Area and City Area committees. Both area committees requested an update report following conclusion of the consultation period. The item was taken to City Area Committee in December and is on the agenda for January's Southern Area meeting.
- I.3 District and County officer's, alongside the prospective developer- Persimmon Homes- have considered the representations made on the draft development brief. A schedule of representations is included with this report summarising the issues that arose and how these have influenced the revised brief.

### **2. Allocation of Land in Local Plan**

- 2.1 Land north of the Portway and surrounding the Partridge Way and Salisbury City FC development was allocated in the Replacement Draft for Deposit Local Plan (1998) and, following the Inspectors Report was included in the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).
- 2.2 The allocation covers approximately 40 hectares and is for a mixed-use development consisting of residential, employment, recreation, community and open space development. The first phase of development (until 2011) will be limited to 630 dwellings (including a minimum 25% affordable housing), 6 hectares of business/light industrial land, recreation and open space provision, and community facilities (including a primary school, community hall and local retail unit). There is scope for further residential development on the site post-2011, although this will be subject to approval in the new Local Development Framework (LDF) process.

### **3. Purpose of the Development Brief**

- 3.1 The purpose of the brief is to provide a framework for the development of the site in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan. When fully adopted, the development brief will have the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to the Local Plan. It will have no statutory status, but will be a material consideration in the determination of a subsequent planning application(s) on the site. It will provide guidance to developers, members of the public and other

interested parties on the aspirations and requirements of the District Council in respect of this site.

3.2 The development brief sets out the planning framework and identifies the requirements of the Local Plan in respect of this allocation and how these should be achieved. For example, delivery of an on-site primary school, public transport provision and affordable housing provision will all need to be secured by Section 106 Agreement.

3.3 The development brief follows a standardised format with principal sections headed as follows:

- Site Characteristics and Appraisal
- Planning Policy
- The Quality of Life & Sustainability
- Development Objectives
- Design Principles (including urban design features)
- Design Proposals
- Service Provision
- Implementation of Development (including proposed phasing)

3.4 The brief includes a detailed Concept Plan demonstrating the relationships between the proposed land uses and the key development objectives. The issues requiring legal agreement are listed in section 9.4 of the brief.

#### **4. Quality of the Development Brief**

4.1 It is critically important that the brief sets a meaningful and robust framework that will deliver through the planning process a very high quality "place" as well as securing the social and technical infrastructure to support the new community. We are seeking to build on and deliver a quality of development that surpasses the step-change achieved at the H9, site at Boscombe Down.

4.2 We are confident that this brief sets such a robust framework and will facilitate the delivery of master plan, design code and then detailed applications that can deliver a very high quality mixed-use development. In this manner it builds on the benchmark set at Boscombe Down and will shape a development that is truly appropriate to its context, produces an real sense of place, fosters a sense of ownership and delivers a high quality environment in which to live and work.

#### **5. Post-consultation Revisions**

5.1 The attached schedule of responses summarises the issues that came out of the consultation exercise. The main issues to note were:

- need for commitment to greater than the minimum 25% affordable housing as originally proposed
- public support for inclusion of the MOD playing fields in the development to provide a more central public open space
- lack of support for the upgrade of Green lane for buses
- local demand for a community hall building that is physically separated from the new school building
- support for land south of the existing football stadium to be included in the pre-2011 development phase because of its potential to provide an important pedestrian link through the development

5.2 Following consideration of all the representations that were received during the 6-week consultation, the draft brief has been revised in various areas including:

- commitment to delivery of 33% affordable housing throughout each phase of the development
- an obligation for prospective developers to fully pursue inclusion of the MOD playing fields into the development scheme to provide a central village green environment
- scope for the land south of the football stadium to come forward before 2011 to encourage the early establishment of a pedestrian/cycle link through this area
- upgrade of Green Lane for pedestrian and cycle access but not for buses or other motor vehicles
- a stand-alone community hall which could be operated independently from the new school
- commitment to deliver community recycling facilities

5.3 The revised development brief was presented to Southern Area and City Area Committee in December. City Area committee gave their support for the revised brief and recommended it to be approved at cabinet. The Southern Area Committee were unable to debate the item due to a problem with the circulation of copies of the revised development brief prior to the meeting. It has since been agreed that the item will be on the agenda of the January SAC meeting to enable members to comment upon the revisions.

5.4 As the January SAC meeting falls after January's Cabinet, members of the Cabinet are recommended to approve the revised brief subject to no significant objections being raised by SAC.

5.5 A copy of the revised development brief is available on the web at [www.salisbury.gov.uk](http://www.salisbury.gov.uk) and available for reference at the Planning Offices, 61 Wyndham Road, Salisbury. Members will receive a copy of the revised brief by the first week of January.

## 6. Recommendation

- (1) That Members note the proposed revisions to the draft development brief, and the support expressed by the City Area Committee, and approve the development brief (subject to comments from the meeting of Southern Area Committee on January 26<sup>th</sup>) as setting a robust framework for delivering a very high quality mixed-use development and associated social and technical infrastructure at Old Sarum.
- (2) That the Cabinet delegate adoption of the brief to the Head of Forward Planning & Transportation following the SAC meeting on January 26<sup>th</sup> providing that SAC does not raise any objections which, in the view of the Head of Forward Planning & Transportation, are so fundamental that they should be referred back to Cabinet.

## 7. Background Papers:

Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003)

Old Sarum Development Brief (November 2004)

### Implications:

- **Financial** : None at this Stage
- **Legal** : None at this stage
- **Human Rights** : Article 6 (the right to a fair hearing) may apply. The consultation process contributes to compliance with this.
- **Personnel** : None at this stage
- **Community Safety**: Being consulted as part of this exercise
- **Council's Core Values**: Excellent service, thriving economy, fairness & equality, open council & willing partner, communicating with the public, supporting the disadvantaged, protecting the environment.
- **Ward(s) Affected**: Laverstock & Ford, Winterbourne, St Mark & Stratford Road

**OLD SARUM  
DEVELOPMENT BRIEF  
PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
RESPONSE RESUME  
PREPARED BY  
SALISBURY DISTRICT COUNCIL**



<b>Response Received From</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Implication for the Development Brief</b>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Support the variety in density range and positioning of these densities as well as the development of differing character areas. Agree with scope to retain mature trees. Welcome bus link and promotion of a range of travel modes. Particularly welcome in the sustainability chapter.	No change
Countryside Agency	In view of our strategic policy role, no observations to make on this proposal.	No change
Cycling Opportunities Group for Salisbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Welcome on site provision of footpaths and cycleways.</li> <li>▪ Welcome provision of two bicycles per dwelling and cycle storage space.</li> <li>▪ Welcome improvements to Green Lane for cyclists and pedestrians but concerned about potential for use by through traffic.</li> <li>▪ Portway crossings should relate to pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>▪ The opportunity should be taken to improve off-site cycle links in addition to existing and proposed pedestrian network.</li> </ul>	Proposal to upgrade Green Lane for bus access has been dropped
DEFRA	No comments as the area of “best and most versatile” agricultural land falls below the threshold of 20 ha.	No change
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support the need for an archaeological evaluation prior to determination. Any nationally important archaeology should be preserved in situ.</li> <li>▪ The development will affect the historically important Old Sarum Airfield. Whilst this is not a conservation area we trust that the planning authority will ensure its setting is protected.</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	No change
English Nature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Object to the lack of reference to wildlife legislation, including the Conservation (Natural Habitats and C) Regulations 1994, particularly relating to the River Avon candidate Special Area of Conservation.</li> <li>▪ Both the Rivers Avon and Bourne form a part of the cSAC/SSSI River Avon and lie within 3 km of the development site. Issues such as pollution during and after construction and additional water requirements should be assessed.</li> <li>▪ Potential impact upon foul water and water demand upon Petersfinger STW should be addressed.</li> <li>▪ There is no mention of bats.</li> <li>▪ There is no mention of the habitat within Area D.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference added to Natural Habitats Regs in s.4.3</li> <li>• need for an Appropriate Assessment will be established at the time of an outline application</li> <li>• wildlife issues including bats should be covered in the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application</li> <li>• Habitat of Area D is included (with the other Areas) in s. 2.13</li> <li>• mention of “water efficiency” added to Design Principles (s.6.17)</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Measures for mitigation should be resolved prior to grant of any permission. The mitigation proposals are necessary to allow for the appropriate level of assessment to be undertaken within the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.</li> <li>▪ Supports the principles of sustainable development, however the meaning of “reasonable endeavours” should be clarified.</li> <li>▪ Supports development objectives, particularly xii and xvi.</li> <li>▪ Design principles should refer to use of water saving measures to reinforce their importance.</li> </ul>	
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The development proposers should be aware that the football club has a licence to abstract water for pitch irrigation. The development should not impact upon this licence.</li> <li>▪ The brief should identify what proportion of the housing will exceed BREEAM Good standard. The delivery of the higher standard should occur within each phase.</li> <li>▪ Para 4.3 relating to BREEAM standards for business units could be worded more positively worded (replacing “reasonable endeavours ...” with “Providing eco-efficient business units to BREEAM standards wherever possible. Opportunities for water saving, grey water recycling, waste management facilities etc, will be developed through the design process”. This should emphasise that the delivery of sustainable buildings are the norm.</li> <li>▪ The Agency supports the provision of SUDs (Note this be Sustainable Drainage Systems, not the more historic reference Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) and has been in early discussions with the developers over this issue.</li> <li>▪ Para 4.3 vii should identify where practicable, a net gain in biodiversity as a result of this development in line with Action 4 of the generic Action Plan of the Wiltshire BAP 2002.</li> <li>▪ Section 6.17 should be renamed (from Energy Efficiency) to include water efficiency and should include a commitment to introducing to upgrade Petersfinger STW will require further discussions relating to volume and water quality discharge.</li> <li>▪ The legal agreement heads of terms should refer to the adoption and on-going maintenance of SUDs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proportion of EcoHome standards to be agreed at the outline planning application stage</li> <li>• brief has been strengthened to commit the developer to “pursue” sustainable design features for the business units rather than simply “consider” (s. 4.3)</li> <li>• references to SUDs replaced with the SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems)</li> <li>• reference to Action 4 of the Wiltshire BAP 2002 added to s.4.3</li> <li>• Section 6.17 now has reference to “water efficiency” as well as energy efficiency</li> </ul>
Government Office for the South West	The First Secretary of State will give substantial weight to SPG that derives from, and is consistent with the Development Plan and has been prepared in the proper manner. Specific comments are that:	No change



Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The purpose of the brief and its relationship to the Salisbury Local Plan is clear.</li> <li>▪ The layout and terminology is clear and well presented.</li> <li>▪ The brief could carry Local Plan policies forward into the main elements of the document. Proposals and objectives could be clearly cross referenced to the relevant plan policies.</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	
Highways Agency	Supports the measures designed to reduce car borne travel. The scheme will require a full Transportation Assessment taking into account the nature of the entire development and its impact upon the A36.	No change
Idmiston Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reiterate the need for the school, shops and doctors surgery to be delivered at an early stage.</li> <li>▪ How will traffic approaching the site from the A338 be addressed in terms of impact upon the Bourne Valley? The solutions should be included within the development brief.</li> <li>▪ The proposed bus route serving Ford and Old Sarum should be expanded to serve the Winterbournes, Gomeldon and even Porton.</li> <li>▪ Foul sewerage could be delivered to the Petersfinger STW via the Hurdcott/Ford pumping station. It is not clear whether this system could cope.</li> </ul>	No change
Laverstock and Ford Parish Council (Two Submissions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Partridge Way should not provide access to the football club or be used for spectator parking.</li> <li>▪ MoD should agree to transfer or share ownership of the playing fields with SDC. This could allow a better grouping of the school, community hall and sports field away from the industrial areas and Portway traffic hazards.</li> <li>▪ Provision for teenage play is required.</li> <li>▪ The medical centre and shop should be sited close to the community centre.</li> <li>▪ The Village Green location is unacceptable as it adjoins a SSSI and the main road.</li> <li>▪ The Highways Department should consider speed limits, signs and crossings.</li> <li>▪ The football club has not implemented the marking out of parking bays as shown on the application drawings reducing the efficiency of the parking area, causing parking to take place in front of houses. The club should consider planning for additional parking should promotion lead to greater attendances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• brief has been amended to obligate the developer to pursue integration of the MOD open space into this development scheme</li> <li>• acknowledgment that the proposed village green is not ideal on the archaeologically sensitive area to the east of the site has been added (s. 4.3 iii)</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The brief should prevent the development of designs such as those recently constructed on London Road.</li> <li>▪ Housing should blend with existing stock and screen planting extended.</li> <li>▪ The footpath proposed to run parallel to the Portway should be extended to Old Sarum Cottages.</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	
National Grid Transco	No comments	No change
Old Sarum Flying Club (Megastream Ltd)	The issue of noise arising from the airfield needs to be taken into account in the design and location of houses and open space.	No change
Old Sarum Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Combining the community centre with the school will limit access and be reliant upon the school governors. Unanimous support for a separate community centre (both the school and community centre should be re-located onto the MoD land, which would be a safer environment and reduce the potential for parking on the Portway.</li> <li>▪ The development should address the problem of football match parking within Partridge Way. Alternative accesses into the football ground should be provided.</li> <li>▪ Rest on red lights should provide a priority to the development residents.</li> <li>▪ A 30 mph limit should be imposed upon the Portway.</li> <li>▪ The masterplan identifies 3 play areas, however 1 already exists within Partridge Way. There needs to be recognition of the lack of youth (rather than toddler) play facilities and facilities provided.</li> <li>▪ Would the opening up of Green Lane to buses remove the free school bus ?</li> <li>▪ Affordable housing should be integrated. Existing social housing should be enhanced to the standards of the surrounding development.</li> <li>▪ The ideal location for the playing field is the MoD playing fields.</li> <li>▪ Footpath links should run through Partridge Way rather than alongside the Portway.</li> <li>▪ Concerns about inadequate parking levels.</li> <li>▪ OSRA intends to undertake a “planning for real” exercise to refine the community needs further.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• brief now makes it clear that the community centre must be separate from the school (s.7.31)</li> <li>• proposal to upgrade Green Lane for buses has been dropped</li> <li>• obligations have been added to pursue integration of the MOD land, ideally to provide the village green (s. 4.3 iii)</li> </ul>
Salisbury Baptist Church and Churches together in Salisbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider that a multi-purpose community hall is crucial. Adequate land should be made available for the range of community facilities required in light of the sites separation from the city itself.</li> </ul>	No change

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The village green and community facilities should achieve a better grouping.</li> <li>▪ If the community centre were to be shared by another organisation such as Christian church it would benefit from a readily available management body, back up organisation and staffing and more effective use of the facility.</li> <li>▪ A church presence could improve management and oversight for sheltered housing and involvement within the school. The involvement of church, community centre and school requires detailed planning of layouts and use requirements at an early stage.</li> </ul>	
Salisbury Civic Society	<p>Generally, the scheme seems an improvement upon the previous draft Brief in that the employment site is concentrated to one end of the site, avoiding commercial traffic running through the site and being more attractive to business. The provision of a primary school, surgery and convenience store will help sustain the development. Reservations relate to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reliance upon a single design solution from the developer. A design guide relating to street design, architecture, screening and environmental issues should be required.</li> <li>▪ The three storey houses shown are neither in character with any other building in the area and architecturally provide little relief. Use of third floor accommodation in the roof space may be more appealing.</li> <li>▪ Could the football club be sited more centrally to create a local buffer zone of open space to either side.</li> <li>▪ The impact of traffic should be assessed at this stage including school runs.</li> <li>▪ Having noted the District Council's Appropriate Assessment work, there seems to be further work required to determine the impact upon the River Avon, in combination with other development proposals within the wider Salisbury area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a Design Code for this development is required by the council (s.10.3)</li> </ul>
Salisbury Community Cars	The development should include a car club within its sustainable transport measures.	No change
Salisbury District Chamber of Commerce	The Chamber is in favour of renewed employment opportunities and reasonably priced housing.	No change
Salisbury District Council (City Area Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Require a substantial increase in affordable housing provision.</li> <li>▪ Social housing to be integrated with private housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the minimum 25% affordable housing has been increased to a definite figure of 33%</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary school should be delivered at outset.</li> <li>Could provide residents with bus vouchers to encourage use.</li> <li>Would like to see provision of a church.</li> <li>Scheme could provide for elderly persons accommodation.</li> <li>What is the impact upon secondary school provision?</li> </ul>	<p>(s.5.2 v)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an element of sheltered accommodation has been added to the central community area (s.7.17)</li> </ul>
Salisbury District Council (Southern Area Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic to football matches causes problems to Partridge Way.</li> <li>Bus service should include stops to serve the football club.</li> <li>Need for adequate internal footways to avoid children having to use the Portway.</li> <li>Green Lane should not be upgraded as this may remove the justification for school bus provision and promote car journeys to school whilst the Council is aiming to reduce car trips.</li> <li>Commercial traffic should not enter the residential site.</li> <li>Important that the MoD playing fields are secured for resident's use.</li> <li>Community building should be separate from the school.</li> <li>Needs to be an improvement in the level of community service provision, including a doctor's surgery.</li> <li>Portway traffic lights should provide priority to traffic existing the estate.</li> <li>Note that there are a number of landowners involved within the development brief site.</li> <li>Consultation required with residents of Ford regarding proposed bus link.</li> <li>Affordable housing should be to high Eco-home standard to reduce future running costs.</li> <li>Should increase pedestrian links through the site.</li> <li>Need all facilities in place before the development starts.</li> <li>Require a further report upon the revisions to the brief before taking the report to the Cabinet.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal to upgrade Green Lane for buses has been dropped</li> <li>obligations to pursue the inclusion the MOD land as open space have been added</li> <li>Community Hall is required to be separate from the school (s.7.31)</li> <li>capacity for a doctor's surgery in the community centre has been added (s.7.30)</li> </ul>
Salisbury District Council (Economic Development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the location of the employment uses in one area.</li> <li>The proposals for B1 uses are in line with the unit's knowledge of existing demand.</li> </ul>	No change
Salisbury District Council (Parks Department)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an urgent need for a cemetery site to serve Salisbury for which funding is available.</li> <li>The wording relating to the possible future use of the MoD playing fields needs to be beefed up. It would be preferable to formalise the inevitable use of these facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a formal obligation for the developer to pursue inclusion of the MOD land to provide the main open space area has been added (s.4.3 iii)</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a range of good quality facilities within the football club that could enhance the setting if developed on a joint basis.</li> <li>▪ The play area on the eastern boundary is in an unacceptable location given its relative isolation.</li> <li>▪ The scheme should include youth facilities given its isolation from the city itself. A skatepark, sportswall and youth shelter should be provided in addition to the traditional playing fields.</li> <li>▪ The brief should consider the issue of football match day parking.</li> <li>▪ The recycling facility should be located close to the retail facilities.</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	
Salisbury Transport 2000	<p>Welcome the positive features, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The mix of uses provided.</li> <li>▪ Emphasis upon walking and cycling.</li> <li>▪ Commitment to 20 minute bus service.</li> </ul> <p>Comments upon points of detail are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The principal bus route should be traffic calmed to 20 mph.</li> <li>▪ Pedestrian priority streets should cover the whole development.</li> <li>▪ There may be parts of the site where a speed limit of lower than 20 mph may be appropriate (homezones). This needs to be built into the initial design.</li> <li>▪ Concern about the baseline to be adopted in establishing the reduction in car trips by 20%. Will the existing dwellings be included within this assessment?</li> <li>▪ Would like to see the promotion of a car share club within the Travel Co-ordinator role.</li> <li>▪ Improving the pedestrian/cycle link via Green Lane to Bishopdown Farm is welcoming, however there needs to be a safe crossing at the Portway to access Green Lane.</li> <li>▪ Improved pedestrian/cycle link to the cycleway along the A345 should be mentioned.</li> </ul>	No change
South Wilts LA 21	The Eco-home reference should be expanded to include reference to solar heating and grey water recycling.	Energy efficiency section has been strengthened (s. 6.17)
South Wilts Mencap	<p>To the western end of the development site there are 3 important services for people with learning disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ the Sarum Adult Resource Centre operated by Wiltshire County Council;</li> <li>➤ Sarum House which is planning to redevelop within the same site; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further clarity over the future of the Sarum Centre and replacement of its facilities within the development has been added following close consultation with WCC (s. 7.17)</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<p>➤ The Shaw Trust Horticultural Centre.</p> <p>The brief proposes the redevelopment of this land, however this will require full consultation and the identification (and provision) of good alternative facilities.</p>	
Wessex Water	<p>A comprehensive scheme for foul and surface drainage for the whole site is required. The development brief should address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Portway sewerage pumping station has capacity to accommodate about 50% of the anticipated flows. Upgrading to this, and the London Road stations will be required.</li> <li>▪ Existing 150 mm foul sewers cross the site and will require a 6m easement to either side. There may be private sewers/ drains crossing the site of which WW do not have records.</li> <li>▪ The scheme will require a new sewerage pumping station, capable of being delivered on a phased basis. Points of connection will require an engineering appraisal.</li> <li>▪ The impact upon the Salisbury STW is not a constraint to development.</li> <li>▪ Surface water drainage should not drain off site.</li> <li>▪ The legal agreement will need to address the construction and long-term management of balancing ponds or infiltration systems.</li> <li>▪ Para 8.2 should be reworded as “Wessex Water anticipate some off-site reinforcement of the existing distribution system and the provision of new, on-site mains will be required to ensure the site is provided with an adequate water supply.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wessex Water’s prediction that off-site improvements are required has been added in s.8.2 as requested</li> </ul>
Wilts and Dorset Bus Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whilst existing bus service to Old Sarum is infrequent, the service through the Beehive is good.</li> <li>▪ The Green Lane bus link benefits the local public transport network. Neither Ford nor Old Sarum can realistically be served by a frequent commercial service that provides an alternative to private transport. The period of developer funded service provision will release current Local Authority subsidy from existing routes.</li> <li>▪ The proposed bus service is of a frequency that will provide Old Sarum with an attractive public transport link with the Greater Salisbury area and Wilton. This will be reflected by the inclusion of Old Sarum in the Salisbury Freedom Ticket area.</li> <li>▪ The loop road design will allow two-way bus use of Green Lane and safe service to Partridge Way.</li> <li>▪ Welcome bus route priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• due to unfavourable responses from other consultees, the proposal to upgrade Green Lane for buses has been dropped</li> </ul>

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The improved service will eliminate existing residents isolation/exclusion.</li> <li>▪ Bus stops should be provided with shelters and real time information and be located every 0.2 miles (approx) at intersections with good natural walk routes. Detailed street designs need to take account of bus stop requirements.</li> </ul>	
Wiltshire County Council (Salisbury Joint Transportation Team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The term “Green Travel Plan” has generally been replaced by “Travel Plan”.</li> <li>▪ Travel Plans apply to a broader definition than employees and covers visitors, customers and servicing.</li> <li>▪ The duration of the Travel Plan co-ordinator is not defined. This post should be funded for a 15 year period following commencement of construction.</li> <li>▪ Frequency of production of the newsletter should be specified.</li> <li>▪ The brief should refer to the Salisbury Transport Plan, not the Integrated Transport Plan.</li> <li>▪ Para 7.32 should be strengthened to read, “Offsite enhancements will be made to provide good quality walking links to connect with the built up urban area of Salisbury.</li> <li>▪ Para 7.33 should include an additional sentence “Offsite the development will make contributions to link the development in with the exiting Salisbury Cycle network, through provision of new routes, including linking into the Laverstock Secondary School and widening of footway along the Portway to the west of Sarum Employment Estate Roundabout”.</li> <li>▪ Would prefer the western access to be via a signal controlled junction rather than re-designed roundabout (less cycle friendly).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the term Green Travel Plan has been replaced with “Travel Plan”</li> <li>• Integrated Transport Plan has been replaced with “Salisbury Transport Plan” (s.7.39)</li> </ul>
Wiltshire County Council (Libraries and Heritage)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The need for archaeological evaluation as part of the planning application is supported. Initial evaluation has identified an unknown barrow to the north of the site together with barrows and a double ditch feature to the west.</li> <li>▪ The open area to the east of the site is of appropriate size to protect known archaeology. Any planting/uses will need to prevent ground disturbance.</li> <li>▪ Support the landscape strategy proposals to assess setting in relation to the SAM Old Sarum.</li> </ul>	No change
Wiltshire Fire Brigade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The industrial units will be subject to fire safety legislation.</li> </ul>	No change

Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access for adequately sized fire appliances should be ensured across the site. Equally, the water supply infrastructure should facilitate such access and use.</li> <li>▪ The Brigade supports the installation of residential sprinklers and strongly urges their use in commercial premises.</li> </ul>	
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	The Environmental Statement should include assessment of water resources, surface runoff and long term impact upon River Avon cSAC.	No change
Representations received from members of the public, including visitors to the two exhibitions together with other interested parties (43 total)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green Lane is unsuited to through traffic. This proposal will detract from its rural character, adversely impact upon amenity of residents of Ford and creates a difficult to control rat run (24).</li> <li>▪ The Portway is at capacity and cannot safely accommodate additional traffic (10).</li> <li>▪ There is no need for additional bus services to Ford (8).</li> <li>▪ Need to control/reduce speed on the Portway (8).</li> <li>▪ This scheme will worsen congestion along Castle Road (6)</li> <li>▪ A supermarket at Bishopdown Farm will increase rat running along Green Lane (4).</li> <li>▪ The development should include a vehicle link direct to the A345 (4).</li> <li>▪ The development should link into the Park and Ride bus service (4).</li> <li>▪ Other non-bus users of Green Lane make restricted access impractical (3).</li> <li>▪ Park and Ride is currently at capacity (3).</li> <li>▪ A Transport Plan for Salisbury is necessary before determining these proposals (3).</li> <li>▪ All community facilities should be provided in Phase 1 (3).</li> <li>▪ Need to control on street parking (3).</li> <li>▪ There are insufficient junctions serving the development (2).</li> <li>▪ Pricing at Park and Ride results in locals driving rather than walking to the facility (2).</li> <li>▪ Bus should extend to Bishopdown Farm (2).</li> <li>▪ Portway should be widened along entire length (2).</li> <li>▪ Scheme does not recognise increased use of Portway over past decade.</li> <li>▪ Junction between Green Lane and Roman Road is inadequate for buses (2).</li> <li>▪ Inadequate cycle links to Green Lane and A345 (2).</li> <li>▪ Need to include MoD playing fields (2).</li> <li>▪ Homezones should extend through site site (2).</li> <li>▪ Noise from Old Sarum airfield will detract from occupant's amenity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proposal to upgrade vehicular traffic on Green Lane has been deleted</li> <li>• efforts to integrate the MOD open space have been added (s.4.3 iii)</li> <li>• Area D will be encouraged as a pre-2011 development rather than left as a post-2011 phase so as to promote the timely delivery of the key pedestrian/cycle link that would negate the need for a route wholly along the Portway (s.7.13)</li> <li>• scope for a the community hall to include a place for Religious Worship (s.7.30)</li> <li>• clarity added about the redevelopment of parts of the Sarum Centre and the relocation of the facilities into the new development (s. 7.17)</li> <li>• further clarity added to the masterplan regarding potential for pedestrian links to the community centre/school area</li> </ul>



Response Received From	Issues Raised	Implication for the Development Brief
	<p>(2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Scheme needs to take account of existing levels of social housing in Partridge Way (2).</li> <li>▪ Local centre should include place of worship (2).</li> </ul> <p>Other comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could buses be routed along Merrifield Road.</li> <li>▪ Welcome bus service to Ford.</li> <li>▪ Bus could additionally serve Winterbourne Valley.</li> <li>▪ The Brief, Local Plan and Pamphlet include confusion over phasing.</li> <li>▪ How will new traffic controls affect existing users of Old Sarum industrial estate?</li> <li>▪ Should the private road west of Green Lane provide an alternative bus link?</li> <li>▪ Trees adjoining Green Lane should be protected.</li> <li>▪ No need for a Greenfield site.</li> <li>▪ Scheme retains insufficient woodland.</li> <li>▪ Detrimental visual impact from Old Sarum itself.</li> <li>▪ Need for roundabouts at both junctions.</li> <li>▪ Density too high.</li> <li>▪ Is there a need for another community building? This will adversely impact upon viability of existing facilities.</li> <li>▪ Who will run the community building?</li> <li>▪ Will developers provide land only or construct facilities as well?</li> <li>▪ The illustrated designs are a step back from the 1998 draft brief.</li> <li>▪ Inadequate archaeological evaluation to date.</li> <li>▪ What will happen to the Shaw Trust operation?</li> <li>▪ At least 50% of housing should be affordable with price controls.</li> <li>▪ There should be no 2<sup>nd</sup> homes.</li> <li>▪ Green corridors do not represent useable open space given safety fears.</li> <li>▪ Additional land should be allocated to ensure a vibrant community.</li> <li>▪ Need for more than a local shop.</li> <li>▪ Partridge Way should link to the school without requiring children to walk along the Portway.</li> <li>▪ Development of Green Lane will allow Norton Drive to be adopted.</li> </ul>	